



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/740,748	12/19/2003	Tin Qian	M1103.70168US00	4932
45840	7590	12/23/2009	EXAMINER	
WOLF GREENFIELD (Microsoft Corporation) C/O WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C. 600 ATLANTIC AVENUE BOSTON, MA 02210-2206			WANG, HARRIS C	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2439		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		12/23/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/740,748	QIAN ET AL.	

Examiner	Art Unit	
HARRIS C. WANG	2439	

All Participants:

Status of Application: _____

(1) HARRIS C. WANG.

(3) Inna Vitol.

(2) James Morris.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 10 December 2009

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

New Matter rejection regarding the limitation "when an application is initiated...to create at least one policy for the application"

Claims discussed:

1

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Edan Orgad/
 Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2439

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner made a new matter rejection regarding the limitation "when an application is initiated..." Applicant's explanation in the response still did not clarify the limitation for the Examiner. In lieu of making a second new matter rejection, the Examiner called the Applicant for clarification on how the pseudo-code in Exhibit C supported the claim limitations.

The Applicant explained that the "application rule" that is matched is simply an "if condition" to determine what type of application is initiated and not the policy itself. After determining which application is initiated, then a policy is created. Applicant also clarified that the "when an application is initiated..." is directed for both the "first user" and the "second user."